

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objections and submits the amended claims are now in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 through 6 as anticipated by Pershan. The Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 6 are patently distinguishable from Pershan. In particular, Pershan does not disclose creating a grammar in light of the utterance received, instead Pershan uses a grammar already existing prior to receipt of the utterance. Amendments to claims 1 and 6 also emphasize that the grammar created is for a subset of the records in the database, rather than Pershan which runs the utterance through the already created grammar.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 7 as obvious in light of Lenning et al. and Pershan. The Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 7 is patentable in light of such references. A key feature of the claimed invention is the use of a confidence value to select whether to send the request to an operator rather than provide an automated answer. In Lenning, a binary decision is made as to whether the automated speech recognition system determines the answer or not, whereas in the claimed invention, the answer is determined by the speech recognition system, but the option of whether to present it to the user depends on the confidence level.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 8 in light of Stanley. The Applicant respectfully submits that Stanley does not anticipate amended claim 8. A particular difference is that Stanley adjusts the gain for future uses of the voice recognition system (see col. 7, lines 43-53). This is very different from the claimed invention, wherein the confidence level is determined by the voice recognition system, rather than the user of the system, and the increased gain is applied to the already recorded utterance, rather than to future utterances.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 as anticipated by Woods. Woods discloses the use of voice recognition in limited situations, particularly the use to determine movie listings and the other limited functions listed in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Claim 9 applies the use of directory services using voice recognition to business listings, which requires a much larger grammar

All of the claims remaining in the application are now believed to be allowable.
Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the required fees of \$525, to
Deposit Account No. 04-0258. If additional fees are believed necessary, the
Commissioner is further authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment
to Deposit Account No. 04-0258.

If questions remain regarding this application, the Examiner is invited to contact
the undersigned at (206) 757-8068.

Respectfully submitted,
John TASCHEREAU
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

By /Brian L. Johnson, Reg. No. 40033/
Brian L. Johnson
Registration No. 40,033

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Facsimile: (206) 757-7700